

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

4/4/2005 4:13 PM FROM: The Culbertson Group The Culbertson Group TO: 17038729306,,002329 PAGE: 012 OF 017

1 **REMARKS**

2 The Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of claims 43 through 59.
3 in view of the above amendments and the following arguments.

4

5 I. **AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS**

6 This case was originally filed with claims 1 through 22. Claims 1 through 22 were
7 canceled and claims 23 through 42 were added by the amendment accompanying the Request for
8 Continued Examination filed December 1, 2004. Claims 23 through 42 are canceled above and
9 new claims 43 through 59 are added. Each of the new independent claims includes the limitation
10 that the prioritized data set includes a number of entries therein with each respective entry
11 ordered with respect to each other entry according to the prioritization scheme and with data for
12 each entry also ordered according to the prioritization scheme. Support for this limitation is
13 found at several locations in the disclosure as filed, and particularly in the discussion beginning
14 at line 10, page 28 of the original application through line 2, page 29.

15

16 II. **AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION**

17 The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors.

18

19 III. **THE CLAIMS ARE NOT DIRECTED TO NON-STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER**

20 The Examiner rejected claims 23 through 29 and 37 through 42 under 35 U.S.C. §101 for
21 being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the outstanding Office Action
22 indicates that the language of these claims is directed to an abstract idea that is not tied to a

1 technological art, environment, or machine which would result in a practical application
2 producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result. The Examiner cited *Ex parte Bowman* (61
3 USPQ2d 1669, 1671) in support of this rejection.

4 It is noted that the claims rejected under Section 101 have been cancelled above and
5 replaced with new claims. Although the new claims include numerous differences with respect
6 to the claims previously rejected under Section 101, the general subject matter of the claims
7 remains the same. Specifically, new claims 43 through 48 are directed to methods similar to
8 claims 23 through 29, and new claims 55 through 59 are directed to systems similar to claims 37
9 through 42. The Section 101 rejections in the currently outstanding Office Action are addressed
10 here in light of the similarities between cancelled claims and new claims 43 through 48 and 55
11 through 59.

12 In *Bowman*, the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because no form of
13 technology was disclosed or claimed in the application. The claimed invention in *Bowman* was
14 not tied to any technological art or environment. In contrast to the fact situation in *Bowman*, the
15 disclosure of the present application includes numerous specific references to processing devices,
16 program code, and physical devices through which the claimed invention may be implemented.
17 The methods set out in claims 43 through 48 are very clearly tied to the technologies and
18 environments described in the disclosure portion of the application. Furthermore, claims 55
19 through 59 are specifically directed to systems for prioritizing data and require specific physical
20 components for providing the desired prioritization. For these reasons the Applicants submit that
21 the present claims are very clearly directed to statutory subject matter and are not objectionable
22 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

1 IV. THE CLAIMS ARE NOT OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF THE CITED REFERENCES

2 The Examiner rejected claims 23 through 42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
3 unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,212,529 to Boothby et al. ("Boothby" or the "Boothby
4 patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,295,541 to Bodnar et al. ("Bodnar" or the "Bodnar patent").

5 The Applicants respectfully submit that the new claims are not obvious over Boothby in view of
6 Bodnar because the proposed combination of references does not teach or suggest each element
7 required in the respective claims.

8

9 Claims 43 through 48

10 Claim 43 is directed to a method for prioritizing data for use in synchronizing data at a
11 client device and requires the following elements:

12 (a) receiving a synchronization session request;
13 (b) selecting a prioritization scheme associated with a user;
14 (c) retrieving scheme effecting data based on the prioritization scheme; and
15 (d) producing a prioritized data set based on the prioritization scheme and the scheme
16 effecting data, the prioritized data set having a number of entries therein with
17 each respective entry ordered with respect to each other entry according to
18 the prioritization scheme and with data for each entry also ordered
19 according to the prioritization scheme. (Emphasis added)

20 The Boothby patent does not teach or suggest the prioritization of data as required by
21 element (d) claim 43. That is, the filtering of records according to Boothby does not order the
22 records according to the prioritization scheme. Also, the filtering of records as disclosed in
23 Boothby does not order the data for each record also according to the prioritization scheme.

24 Rather, the Boothby patent merely applies a filter which results in some records in a source data
25 set being flagged as passing the filter and the remainder of the records being flagged as not

1 passing the filter. This flagging of certain records does not represent a prioritized data set, that
2 is, a preferentially ranked or ordered data set, as required by claim 43. Furthermore, the flagging
3 of records based on filter criteria as taught by Boothby, has no effect on data included for the
4 various records. That is, nothing in the Boothby patent suggests preferentially ordering the data
5 for the various records.

6 The Bodnar patent does not make up for these deficiencies in Boothby. Bodnar discloses
7 synchronizing data between a number of different databases. In particular, from col. 40, line 13
8 through col. 41, line 31 Bodnar teaches that the records in each client database are linked to a
9 particular record in the synchronizing engine's database in accordance with a mapping table. As
10 described beginning at col. 42, line 31, each time a synchronization takes place between
11 databases, this mapping table may be used to identify the files that need to be updated, added, or
12 deleted. The synchronizing engine then determines any changes that have been made to the
13 records to be synchronized, determines a set of actions to take for each record, and then
14 synchronizes the records. There is nothing in the Bodnar patent that teaches or suggests selecting
15 a prioritization scheme associated with a user as required by element (b) of claim 43, retrieving
16 a scheme effecting data based on the prioritization scheme as required by element (c) of claim 43,
17 and producing a prioritized data set as required by element (d) of claim 43.

18 Because the Boothby and Bodnar patents, either considered alone or in combination, do
19 not teach or suggest the prioritization required by element (d) of claim 43, claim 43 cannot be
20 obvious in view of the references. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 43 is
21 in condition for allowance together with its respective dependent claims, claims 44 through 48.
22

1 Claims 49-54 and 55-59

2 Independent claim 49 is directed to a program product requiring limitations similar to
3 those in claim 43. In particular, claim 49 requires prioritization program code executable for
4 producing a prioritized data set based on a selected prioritization scheme and scheme effecting
5 data, “**the prioritized data set having a number of entries therein with each respective entry**
6 **ordered with respect to each other entry according to the prioritization scheme and with**
7 **data for each entry also ordered according to the prioritization scheme.**” Therefore, the
8 above arguments and comments regarding claim 43 apply with equal force to claim 49 and its
9 dependent claims. Because the proposed combination of Boothby and Bodnar does not teach or
10 suggest any element for performing the prioritizing specifically required of the prioritization
11 program code in claim 49, claim 49 and its dependent claims, claims 50 through 54 are not
12 obvious in view of the proposed combination of Boothby and Bodnar and are entitled to
13 allowance.

14 New independent claim 55 is directed to a system for providing a prioritized data set and
15 also includes limitations as to the prioritization similar to those set out in claim 43. In particular,
16 claim 55 requires a sync engine component that, among other things, produces a prioritized data
17 set based on a selected prioritization scheme and scheme effecting data, where the prioritized
18 data set has “a number of entries therein with each respective entry ordered with respect to each
19 other entry according to the prioritization scheme and with data for each entry also ordered
20 according to the prioritization scheme.” Therefore, the above arguments and comments regarding
21 claim 43 also apply with equal force to claim 55 and its dependent claims. Because the proposed
22 combination of Boothby and Bodnar does not teach or suggest any element for performing the

1 prioritizing function specifically required in claim 55, claim 55 and its dependent claims, claims
2 56 through 59 are not obvious in view of the proposed combination of Boothby and Bodnar and
3 are entitled to allowance.

4

5 V. CONCLUSION

6 For all of the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully request consideration and
7 allowance of claims 43 through 59. If the Examiner should feel that any issue remains as to the
8 allowability of these claims, or that a further conference might expedite allowance of the claims,
9 she is asked to telephone the Applicants' attorney, Russell D. Culbertson, at the number listed
10 below.

11

12

13

14

15 Date: April 7, 2005

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

Respectfully submitted

The Culbertson Group, P.C.

By:

Russell D. Culbertson, Reg. No. 32,124

Russell Scott, Reg. No. 43,103

Trevor Lind, Reg. No. 54,785

1114 Lost Creek Boulevard, Suite 420

Austin, Texas 78746

512-327-8932

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, (Facsimile No. 703-872-9306) on April 7, 2005.

Russell D. Culbertson, Reg. No. 32,124

1057_Response_OA_050103.wpd

Page 16 of 16

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.